THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men" Luke 2, 14.

"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth Salvation." Isa 52. 7.

VOL. II. SATURDAY, DEC. 1. 1824. NO. 20.

STRICTURES UPON A SERMON ENTITLED "FUTURE REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS, THE SUBSTANCE OF A DISCOURSE DELIVERED BEFORE THE NEW-ENGLAND CONFERENCE OF METHODIST MINISTERS, PROVIDENCE JUNE 17, 1823. BY REV. WILBUR FISK, A. M."

Few modern productions in favor of the endless torments of hell, have been written with more ability and candour, than the above named sermon of Mr. Fisk. Some of Mr. F's arguments are so specious that a superficial, much more a superstitious reader, would probably think them conclusive. If our limits would permit, we should give our readers Mr. F's discourse entire. As we are now situated, we shall content ourselves with a few brief remarks, offered in the spirit of christian candour, which are submitted to the inspection of the world, and of our Methodist brethren in particular.

Mr. F. selected Ps. 62. 12. for his text. "*Also unto thee; O Lord, belongeth mercy: for thou renderest to every man, according to his work.*" After a few appropriate introductory remarks, Mr. F. divided his subject in the following manner.

"First. God rewards and punishes every man according to his works.

Second. Because God rewards and punishes every man according to his works, he is therefore a God of mercy."

Mr. F. very justly says "the truth of this" (i. e. the first) "proposition rests not on one or two passages of scripture, but on the whole tenor of the bible."—He then proceeds to quote twelve passages of scripture to prove this proposition. We perfectly agree with our author that "these passages are so plain that they need no comment." We think this point clearly and fully established.

The second item under the first proposition, relates to the *time* when rewards and punishments are administered. He says, "when does God render to every man according to his works"? He further says, "But we cannot fix upon the time when this shall take place, merely from the tense of the verb. But the time when must be determined from God's known method of proceeding, and from the time marked out by his word." Our author then says, "Now *we know* God does not reward every man according to his works in this world." How does he *know* this? He has given no evidence how he and his colleagues came by this *knowledge*. But he says, "*Now we know.*" &c. Let us compare what our author says "we know" with the language of inspiration. Prov. 11. 31. "*Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner.*"

Again. Mr. F. says, "But the sinner is not always the most wretched here, neither is the saint always the most happy.—Compare their *outward* condition." We have the bare assertion of our author that the sinner is not always the most wretched here, neither is the saint always the most happy." What an awful religion that must be which is no manner of advantage to its possessors on this side of the grave! The desire of happiness is so powerfully operative in the human heart, that if men believe *religion* would make them more miserable than they would be without it; they will evidently continue *sinful* as long as possible, that they may be immediately as *happy* as possible! But Mr. F. says "compare their outward enjoyments." It is certainly very extraordinary that any one who has carefully studied the condition of human nature, and has duly reflected upon the felicity of intelligent life, should refer to "the *outward* enjoyments" of mankind to determine their *real* or *spiritual* happiness. Man might possess all possible *external* blessings, and still be a miserable being. It is presumed also, that a man might be destitute of most of those things called "outward enjoyments," and still be in the possession and enjoyment of spiritual life in Christ. It is true the apostle Paul says, 1 Cor. 15. 19. "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable;" but this expres-

sion is evidently founded on the supposition that there should be no *resurrection*, no *future life*, in which case the apostle's religion is vain and useless. But as the apostle had a well grounded *hope* in eternal life—he, and those who possess like precious faith, are manifestly "of all men" the most *happy*. St. Paul says, 1 Cor. 9. 18. "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel." Notwithstanding all the "outward" calamities to which he was subjected, the apostle was certainly more happy in this world than he could have been, had he not known, believed and preached the gospel.

Our author quotes St. Math. 5. 12.—"Great is your reward in heaven," to show that believers are to be rewarded in a future state for their sufferings in this world. But if we look at the whole of the 11th and 12th verses, we shall perceive, that our Saviour was speaking of *present*, not future reward. "Blessed are ye (at what time?) *when* men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake: rejoice and be exceeding glad;" (i. e.) rejoice in the present time) "for great is your reward in heaven." When? At the present time. Many passages might be quoted to shew that, by the phrase "kingdom of heaven," our Saviour usually meant the doctrine of the gospel, with its immediate happy effects. The following may suffice: St. Math. 12. 28. "But if I cast out devils by the spirit of God then the *kingdom of God* is come unto you." St. Luke 4. 43. "I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also." St. Luke 17. 21. "For behold the kingdom of God is *within* you." We presume no one will undertake to show a difference between the kingdom of heaven, and the kingdom of God.

Again our author says, "the sinner on the other hand, frequently flourishes." To substantiate this, he quotes from the 73d Psalm. He does not seem to have observed that the writer whose language he cites, "was *envious* at the foolish," when he said those things concerning the *happiness* of the wicked. The same writer on the same subject says, Ps. 73. 22. "So foolish was I and *ignorant*; I was as a beast before thee"! Surely our author should not rely for evidence of any doctrine, upon language thus disapprobated by the writer of it!

Mr. F. says, "Neither can it be conceded that the balances of retributive justice are equalized in this world, by the compunctions of conscience in the one case, and its approbation in the other." To show that the above, "cannot be conceded"; Mr. F. *asserts* as follows, "for many a scripulous saint has suffered more in his feelings, for his inadvertent errors, or even for his unavoidable imperfections, than some hardened transgressors do for heinous crimes." We should like to know whether Mr. F. speaks from *experience* in this case, or not. Assertion is not argument. We would merely say that Mr. F. will admit that he does not view this subject with an *omniscient* eye, and therefore may be mistaken.

Again he says, "As God has taught the saint to look for his reward, in another world, so also he has taught the sinner, if he would learn, that *his* reward awaits him hereafter." He then refers to St. Luke 12. 5. "I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him which *after he hath killed*, hath power to cast into hell; yea I say unto fear you him." We may profitably connect, with the above a parallel passage in St. Math. 10. 28. "And fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." It is proper to observe that the above language, in both instances, was addressed to the *disciples*, to guard them against the *fear of man*. The primitive signification of the original word *Geheuna* rendered *hell* in the above passages, was "the valley of the son of Hinnom. It is as evident that this *valley* was in this world, as it is that the cities of *London* and *Paris* are in this world. God is *able* to destroy, or annihilate the souls and bodies of his creatures, if he should see fit. But it is not said in scripture, that he *will* thus destroy his creatures. St. Math. 3. 9. "God is *able* of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." But does the scripture say that God *will* do this? Most certainly the scripture says no such thing.

The next reference made by our author, is the following, St. Luke 16th chapter.—"The rich man who had received his good things in this life also died, & was buried, & in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torment." Mr. F. probably did not recollect, that, in the above parable, nothing is said concerning the *character*, either of the rich man or the beggar! If it be said that the rich man was *wicked*, and that the beggar

was *righteous*, we ask, how is this known? It is mere conjecture. The Greek word *Hades*, which in this parable is rendered *hell*, figuratively signifies anguish of mind, but *literally* it means the *grave, the general receptacle of the dead*, without the least reference to their conduct, good or bad. The beggar was in *Hades* or hell, as well as the rich man, otherwise they could not have had *conversation* with each other! So much for the everlasting contradiction and absurdity of tradition!

Mr. F. next refers to the explanation of the parable of the wheat and the tares, St. *Math.* 13th chapt. "In the end of this world, the son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." The opinion usually entertained on this subject, is, that the *wheat* means the *righteous* the *tares* mean the *wicked* and that "the end of this world" means the dissolution of the material world when a final separation shall take place between the righteous and the wicked. Now if we admit this construction, may we not ask; did Christ come to save the *righteous* or the wicked? "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Thus saith the Saviour of the world. The Greek word aionos, which is rendered *world* in this explanation does not signify the earth, nor any other planet; but it signifies an *age* or *dispensation*. This word is frequently so used in scripture. If we admit that the righteous and the wicked, or believers and unbelievers are represented by the wheat and the tares, the burning of the tares cannot be made to signify endless torments; because nothing is said of such an event in the bible, and because we have scriptnre authority to apply this furnace of fire, where there is weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth, to the destruction of the jews by the Roman armies. See Ezek. 22. 17 to 22. inclusive. "And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, son of man, the *house* of Israel is to me, become dross: all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace, they are even the dross of silver; therefore thus saith the Lord God; because ye are all become dross, behold therefore, I will *gather you into the midst of Jerusalem.* As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in mine anger and in my fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you, yea I will gather you, and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof, and ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you." The pouring out of God's fury in judgment upon the house of Israel, when gathered in Jerusalem; is very different from the out-pouring of vindictive wrath to the endless ages of eternity!

Mr. F. quotes a part of the parable of the sheep and goats as contained in the 25th chap. of Math. to show that the wicked will be punished forever in a future world. "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels." Upon the authority of our Saviour, we inform Mr. F. that this parable has no relation to a general judgment in another world. Christ says St. Math. 24, 34, 35. "Verily I say unto you, *this generation* shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." If Christ understood this subject, Mr. F. must be mistaken; and *vice versa*. The judgment represented by this parable is a *past* and not a *future* event.

Mr. F. thinks that "the very idea of a general judgment, decides this question without further argument." Hence he says, "of what use are a trial and a judgment after the whole penalty of the law has been inflicted on the criminal? None." Mr. F. does not seem to perceive that a general judgment, is, at all events, useless. If the endless destiny of every human being be unalterably fixed at death; what possible advantage could be obtained by a *trial* and a *judgment?* Would such trial alter that which is unalterable? If not, it would be altogether nugatory! Mr. F. says "some attempts have been made, of late, to do away the idea of a general judgment altogether. Attempts that I need not now meet; for they were fairly met and put down by an abler hand,* at the first onset." Here our author refers to a written controversy, concerning a general judgment, between Rev. H. Pallou, and Rev T. Merritt, which was published a few years since in Boston. Mr. F. says

*Rev. T. Merritt,

these "attempts" ("to do away the idea of a general judgment,") "were fairly met and put down." This is bare assertion. An assertion to the contrary would amount to just as much on the other side. We have seen the controversy referred to, and we are fully convinced that any impartial reader would dissent from Mr. F's opinion that those "attempts were fairly met and put down;" and would perceive that those "attempts" were successful.

The third item under the first proposition, is, "to enquire what those works are according to which God will reward or punish every man." Mr. F. thinks the fate of mankind will "turn upon their *believing* or *not* believing the gospel." He probably did not recollect that millions of the human race never hear of the gospel in this world! After citing a few passages such as, "He that believeth shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned;" he says, "from such scriptures it is plain, that a man will be finally condemned and punished, not for having been morally diseased, but for having rejected the remedy for disbelieving the truth of God. Thus, by rejecting Christ he renders himself *responsible* for all his sinfulness, and attaches to himself the *guilt* of all his transgressions." Reader dost thou perceive what Mr. F. has done? He says the sinner "by rejecting Christ renders himself *responsible* for all his sinfulness!" Pray was not the sinner "*responsible* for all his sinfulness" before he rejected Christ? If the sinner were not *responsible* for his sinfulness *before* he rejected Christ; in what did his *sinfulness* consist? His *sinfulness* could have been no inconvenience to him, if he had not been *responsible* for it! But Mr. F. says, "by rejecting Christ he" (the sinner) "*attaches to himself the guilt* of all his transgressions." What does Mr. F. mean by a sinner's "attaching to himself the guilt" of his own crimes? Does he mean that before a sinner "attaches his *guilt* to himself; his *guilt* is attached to some other being? If so, we should like to know by what rule of *equity*, Mr. F. can make one intelligent being *guilty* for the crime of *another!* Does Mr. F. mean that a sinner is not *responsible* for his deeds, till he has done something to attach his own guilt to himself? If so, why is he a sinner? Can a man be a sinner without being responsible or guilty? The immutable laws of the divine government have established a necessary connexion between *crime*, *guilt* and *punishment*: and it is in vain for any dependent being to attempt to destroy this connexion. Again Mr. F. says, "on the other hand, a man will be finally acquitted and rewarded, not because he has always been justified and holy, but because by faith in Christ, the guilt of all his sins has been washed away, and he now stands justified and approved in the sight of God. Continuing and dying a believer, he will be acquitted at the final tribunal, and be rewarded with a crown of glory. All his sins will doubtless be brought into judgment. But for these *he has an offset*, in the faith which he has exercised in the merits of Jesus Christ." The reader will recollect that Mr. F's. first labour was to prove that "*every man*" will be rewarded "according to his work." This he found abundant scripture testimony to prove. He now tells us that the sinner will have "*an offset*" for all his aggravated crimes, if he possess faith in Christ! Faith balances and over-balances the account of his sins; and by means of this "offset," he delivers himself from just punishment! Thus Mr. F. has contradicted himself and the scriptures also! He says, "thus we see, pardon is consistent with being judged, according to the deeds done in the body. For faith, which gains this pardon is exercised by the soul while in the body and is *one* of those works that is brought into judgment. And it is that work which, by the divine appointment, operates thro' Christ, to the *cancelling* of the whole debt of sin. It does more—It gains heaven." Thus after Mr. F. has proved from scripture, that every man must be rewarded according to his works; he then tells us that God will reward the believer for *one* work and *cancel* all his crimes! Is it not plain that if the believer should not be rewarded for his evil works as well as for his good ones; he will not receive his deserts? Is it not absurd to talk of *cancelling*, i. e. effacing sins, after having proved that every man will be strictly rewarded according to his deserts? If the sins of the believer should be *cancelled*, in the sense in which we now speak, he could not be rewarded for them. If he should be rewarded for them, they could not be cancelled. The assertion that faith "gains heaven" will be attended to hereafter. We will now show the absurdity of Mr. F's. system, and of every system of limit-

ed salvation. The believers in endless misery contend that sinners justly deserve never-ending torments for their sins; they admit that all mankind have "sinned and come short of the glory of God;" and they strenuously contend that all men will be rewarded according to their works. What is the necessary conclusion from these premises? Answer; if sin deserve endless suffering, if all have sinned, and if all shall receive what they deserve; then the whole human race must inevitably suffer the endless torments of hell! Ye preachers of eternal misery! Why do you not preach universal damnation? The same premises which establish the endless misery of any, equally establish the endless misery of all mankind. In confirmation of the positions we have proved to be incorrect, Mr. F. says, Hence the decision will be, "Come ye blessed inherit the kingdom--*for* I was hungry &c." hence the sentence will be, "Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire--*for* I was hungry and ye gave me no meat &c." Let it not be forgotten that we have already proved by the express language of Christ, that the judgment predicted in the parable of the sheep and goats, relates to this world, and not to a future state.

The fourth item under the first proposition, is, "what is the extent to which these works are rewardable or punishable?" Mr. F. says, "In *degree* the rewards and punishments will be *limited*, and will vary according to the character and circumstances of the subjects." If the rewards and punishments of eternity be *limited in degree*, and vary according to the *character* &c. of the subjects; surely there will be but very little difference between *heaven* and *hell*. The most virtuous men who are sent to hell, may be even better characters than the most *wicked* men who finally reach the abodes of bliss; hence if their condition should vary according to their *characters;* some of hell's inhabitants will be more happy than some of the saints in heaven! At all events, the difference in the *degree* of happiness or misery, in heaven and hell could be but very little; if the *character* of each individual should constitute that difference. There is not such a vast difference of *character* in this life, as the *pride* of many people leads them to believe! Mr. F. says, man's "endless existence may be either happy or miserable." True, it may by the divine appointment, but not by man's own exertion. He further says, "the eternal life which is conferred upon the righteous, is the reward of faith and its fruits." To prove this, he quotes 2d Cor. 4, 17. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." If Mr. F. had looked back to the 14th verse of the same chapter, he would have seen that this *working* is ascribed to God and not man.--"knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus *shall raise* up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." We might as reasonably ascribe the resurrection to the power of man, as to ascribe an eternal weight of glory to man's works. For the same purpose Mr. F. quotes Col. 3, 23, 24. "And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as to the Lord and not unto men, knowing that of the Lord, ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance." An *inheritance* is a possession proceeding from the ability and kindness of a parent; and therefore is not the *reward* of the child's conduct. The fact of the bestowment of an inheritance, may be made use of, to excite gratitude and obedience in the child; and that obedience may produce a corresponding reward; but the inheritance itself is the gift of the parent. To show that of the Lord we are to receive an eternal inheritance, and that this inheritance proceeds from the loving-kindness of God and is not the effect of faith, good works, or any act of man, we have the express language of scripture, Ephes. 2, 8, 9, 10. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and *that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works*, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Herein we are taught that *faith* is the gift of God--that we are saved by grace, and not works, that we are God's workmanship and not our own --that *good works* are the consequence of our having been created in Christ Jesus, and not the *cause* of this new creation. If the Apostle had been refuting the opinion adopted by *Mr.* F. he could not have used language more pertinent. *M*any other passages might be produced to confirm this position, but this is thought to be sufficient.

The whole of Mr. F's labor to show that the wicked will be rewarded with interminable suffering, because the righteous will receive an endless reward for

their faith and good works, is fruitless; for the righteous, so called, will receive no such reward. They will receive eternal life, which is the gift of God, while a just recompense of reward for all their good deeds, will fall infinitely short of an *inheritance* incorruptible, undefiled, & that fadeth not away. Mr. F. goes on and says, "But, as we have seen, the reward of one character is without end. How probable then, that the punishment of the opposite character will be without end." But we *have seen* no such thing. We have proved to the contrary. Did the world ever witness such an extravagant notion as that the never-ending felicity of heaven should be expected as the *reward* of the imperfect obedience of mortals, in this fleeting, momentary life? Again, Mr. F. says, "To neglect the offers of God is criminal in proportion to the extent of the blessing proffered by God, and rejected by the transgressor. But the blessing proffered by God and rejected by the transgressor, is infinite. Therefore, to neglect this blessing is an act stamped with infinite turpitude." Mr. F. reasons well upon false premises. We have already proved that man is not entitled to an infinite reward. Again, Mr. F. says, "The extent of the criminality of sin, is in proportion to the dignity of the character insulted." This principle he considers to be "obvious to common sense, recognized in civil governments, and taught in the scriptures." We think this principle is not "obvious to the common sense of all mankind," is not acknowledged by civil governments, and is not taught in the scriptures. Does common sense teach that a child 7 years of age is as criminal for transgressing his parent, as one 17 years old would be for transgressing the same command of the same parent? We think not. If this principle were admitted in "all civil governments," it is easy to see that an *idiot* might become as criminal as the most intelligent man in community; for if both these persons should perform an act which constituted a breach of the law, both would sin against the same dignity of character! But let us examine his scripture proof on this subject. He quotes Heb. 10. 28, 29. "He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be tho't worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath done despite to the spirit of grace? Mr. F. then observes, "here, to trample under foot the Son of God, and do despite to the spirit of grace, as they were acts immediately against higher characters, were considered by the inspired apostle, as meriting sorer punishment." But was there any difference of character sinned against in the instances above named? Yes, if the law of Moses was not the law of *God*; but if the law of Moses was the law of God, then men sinned against God by transgressing the law of Moses; Moses being the instrument through whom God gave his law. Those who did "despite to the spirit of grace" were thought worthy of sorer punishment, because they had greater privileges and more knowledge; therefore the *degree* of criminality must be determined by the *degree* of knowledge and capacity to understand, of which a man is possessed.—This principle is recognized in the scriptures. "It shall be required of a man according to that he hath, and not according to that he hath not." To sin against God, therefore, is not a crime of infinite demerit, unless it be admitted that man possesses an infinite capacity.

Again, Mr. F. says, "It must be acknowledged, that the violation of an obligation is criminal in proportion to the extent of that obligation. But man is under infinite obligation to God. Therefore, to violate these obligations is a sin infinitely aggravated." Man is under infinite obligations to God as the author of all the blessings of time and eternity; but man is not under obligation to obey an infinite law; because such law cannot be adapted to the human capacity. Therefore Mr. F's. conclusion is incorrect.

[*To be continued.*

To the Editor of the Herald.

Dear Sir,

Having lately read in the Herald of Salvation, a piece "from the Unitarian Miscellany," entitled "Doctrine of two natures in Christ," and finding that it contained some ideas entirely new to me, and not feeling altogether satisfied respecting it, I persuaded a particular friend of mine, who professes to believe in the doctrine of the trinity, to peruse it; and he immediately referred me to the 1st chapter of the Hebrews, particularly to the eighth and tenth verses, from which he inferred that Jesus was the very God, and from the 9th verse he contended, that Christ was

spoken of in his human character. Now, sir, if you will give me your opinion on those passages, with whatever observations you may think proper to elucidate the subject, you will confer an obligation on one who, though nurtured in the trinitarian belief, would willingly, if convinced by scripture and reason, yield it for that which you so strongly advocate.

I am, sir, very respectfully, yours, &c.

N. C. C.

REMARKS.

In the communication which was taken from the "Unitarian Miscellany"; it was clearly shown, that the doctrine of two natures in Christ, "involves an absurdity; that it destroys the personal unity of Jesus Christ; that it exposes him to the charge of equivocation and dishonesty; that it introduces the utmost confusion and uncertainty into the sacred writings; that it is unnecessary; that it receives no support from the scriptures; and that it is attended with difficulties, far greater than those it professes to remove." Now, unless the arguments by which the above positions were supported, can be invalidated, it is in vain to refer to any particular passage, or passages, as evidence against those conclusions which are fairly drawn, and fully substantiated by the scriptures. To illustrate this more perfectly, we will confine ourselves to one particular; "the doctrine of two natures in Jesus Christ exposes him to the charge of equivocation and dishonesty": admitting this position to have been fully established, (and we think it has been) what would be effected by *inferring* from any passage of scripture, that Christ had two natures? Answer. It must necesssarily be *inferred* that he was guilty of "*equivocation and dishonesty*"!!!

The objector will find his objections anticipated in the concluding remarks of "A. L." "If the objections stated in the foregoing pages have any force, the doctrine of two natures in Jesus Christ is attended with difficulties, we do not hesitate to say, far more embarrassing, than those it professes to remove. Admitting the latter to be as great as they appear to the advocates of the doctrine under consideration, they amount, we conceive, to this, and nothing more—that *apparently* discordant expressions are occasionally found in the scriptures, which this doctrine reduces into harmony with each other—that the sacred writers, in speaking of Christ, use language which appears consistent only on the supposition that he possessed both a divine and a human nature. To remove apparent discrepancies, *an hypothesis is employed, which, according to the view we have of it, mars the simplicity and darkens the sense of the sacred writings; subjects our Saviour to the charge of dishonesty or falsehood; and involves an impossibility and absurdity*". Very little need be said to show that the eighth, ninth and tenth verses of the first chapter of Hebrews do not support the *supposition* of two natures in Christ. In our common translation of the bible those verses read thus: "But unto the son he saith, thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And thou, Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands." Now look back to the beginning of the chapter, verses 1 and 2. "God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his son, whom he (God) hath appointed heir of all things." Verse 3—"Who being the brightness of his (the Father's) glory, and the express image of his person (no being can be the *image* of himself) sat down at the *right hand* of the Majesty on high." Verse 4—*Being made* so much better than the angels," &c. All the above expressions clearly distinguish God from his son, and speak of the latter as a dependent being. In verse 8 it is said, but unto the Son he saith, "thy throne, O God, is forever and ever;" or, "God is thy throne to the age of the age." Here we admit that the Son is called *God;* but the next verse shows that the term God, when applied to the Son, was used in a subordinate sense; i. e. that Christ was not the supreme God; for it is said, "therefore God, *even thy God*, hath annointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Here it is perfectly plain, that Christ did not anoint himself, and though he was called *God*, yet he had a God superior to himself, by whom he was anointed and exalted. No word means the same thing when applied to subjects different in their very nature. Hence it is not saying too much, to say that the word *God* does not mean as much when applied

to the son of God, as it does when applied to God himself. To show that the word *God* is scripturally used in a *subordinate* sense, we have the plainest testimony. St. John 10. 34, 35, 36—"Jesus answered them, is it not written in your law, I said ye are *Gods?* If he called them Gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the *Father hath sanctified and sent* into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said, *I am the Son of God?*" The tenth verse of the first chapter of Hebrews, is a quotation from the latter part of the 102d Psalm, and has no possible reference to Jesus Christ. The term *Lord*, there refers to the Supreme God, and to him only. The remarks which have been made in relation to the word *God*, will apply to the term *Lord*. Indeed, this whole subject seems so perfectly clear, that it is matter of astonishment that it should ever have been cited to prove the doctrine of the trinity, the deity of Jesus Christ, or the notion of two natures in Christ: doctrines not only absurd and contradictory in themselves, but not named in the bible.

POETRY.

[*From the Village Recorder.*]

AUTUMN.

Now low'ers around the clouded sky,
The yellow leaf falls fast and lone,
The breeze is sighing o'er the lawn,
With lengthen'd moan.—

And Nature all is hastening on
To winter's dread and drear repose—
The bloom and fragrance long have gone,
Of flow'r and rose!

Creation now, her verdure done,
Will soon assume an aspect bare,
And frosts their blasting influence shed,
And chilly air!

The bird no more is tuning wild,
His joyous notes on every bough,
But mounting high on fairy wing,
Forsakes us now,

For fairer climes and purer skies,
Where warmly blows the balmy air,
No howling winds disturb his rest,
No winter there!

How sadly strikes the feeling heart,
The loneliness that spreads around—
The leaf, that severed by the breeze,
Falls to the ground!

Fit emblem of our fleeting joys—
Which bud awhile, and blossom high,
But blasted soon, by biting woe,
They fade and die!

And peace and hope—affection warm—
The kindred ties of love and bliss,
Have felt, and keenly yet shall feel,
An hour like this!

The heart now beating high and warm,
Shall cease its throbs some future day,
And lowly laid beneath the turf,
Shall know decay!

Oh time! thy triumphs who shall tell?
The trophies of thy fame record?
Thou speak'st—and humbled nations bow
Before thy word!

And genius bright—and beauty fair—
The lov'd—the blooming—and the gay—
Affection—friendship—love itself
Must own thy sway;

But tho' now Desolation rides
With blighting wings upon the wind,
He yet shall know his blasting pow'r
To time resigned!

For spring shall come, with charms renewed
To bid Creation smile again—
And warbling birds, and trees and flow'rs,
Shall hail her reign!

Then look the vista thro' of years,
Behold the "Bow of Promise" bright,
It spreads its arch of purest glow,
To the glad sight!

Tho' man by nature, yet must feel
The blighting hour of woe and grief,
And know the self same fate, that knows
The yellow leaf;

Yet he shall rise renewed from death,
The glorious victor in the strife—
And disenthrall'd from Time, put on
Immortal life!

ALCANZOR, *of Baltimore*

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT WATERTOWN N. Y. AT $1 00 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE. W. WOODWARD, PRINTER.